DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 919 IR 013 304

AUTHOR Abedor, Allan J.; Sachs, Steven G.
TITLE Faculty Development (FD), Organizational Development (OD), and Instructional Development (ID): Choosing an Orientation.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 11p.; In: Instructional Development: The State of the Art, II; see IR 013 273. For volume I, see ED 292 444.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; Consultants; *Faculty Development; Higher Education; *Instructional Development; *Instructional Innovation; *Organizational Development; *Readiness

ABSTRACT

This chapter considers the different emphases that an instructional improvement agency can adopt--faculty development, instructional development, organizational development, or some combination. Seven alternative emphases are outlined, and the advantages and disadvantages of each approach are described. The importance of three factors is emphasized: (1) the overall level of readiness for innovation; (2) size and capabilities of the instructional improvement staff; and (3) the availability of outside consultants. Guidelines for choosing a particular emphasis and examples of the application of these guidelines are provided. (28 references) (Author/EW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED298919

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

B. APPLICATIONS

Chapter 31

Faculty Development (FD), Organizational Development (OD), and Instructional Development (ID): Choosing an Orientation

Allan J. Abedor
Steven G. Sachs

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Charles Dills

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Instructional improvement agencies exist in many organizations. The roles of these agencies vary greatly. It is important for such agencies to do well what they do. It is, therefore, imperative that these agencies not try to be all things to all people, for seldom in these austere times will resources be adequate to do so. This chapter provides guidance in the choice of which emphasis (FD, ID, OD or some combination) an organization should adopt. Seven alternative emphases are outlined.

IR013304

INTRODUCTION

Over the past decade, a trend in higher education has been to establish centers, agencies, and programs which have the mission of facilitating the improvement of teaching. By the mid-1970s, programs for the improvement of teaching had been created in over one-half of the 2,600 accredited degree-granting institutions in the United States (Centra, 1976). Variability in the organization and placement of these agencies has been well described by Durzo (1978).

The broad range of activities performed by these instructional improvement agencies has been described by a number of authors including Lindquist (1978), Bergquist and Phillips (1977), Centra (1976), Alexander and Yelon (1972), Merry and Allerhand (1977), and Sargent (1979). Several authors, such as Gaff (1975) and Bergquist and Phillips (1975), suggest that the extensive range of instructional improvement agency activities be classified into three categories: (1) Faculty Development (FD), (2) Instructional Development (ID), and (3) Organizational Development (OD).

It has gradually become evident that various instructional improvement programs across the country have emphasized different categories of activities. For example, many programs have emphasized the development of self-awareness and teaching skills of faculty members (FD). Other programs have emphasized the development of adoption of innovative methods of teaching (ID), and still others have focused upon improving the organization within which instruction takes place (OD). The questions naturally arise as to what programmatic emphasis should an instructional improvement agency follow? What are the implications of emphasis upon FD, OD, or ID on the efficiency, effectiveness, and even the survival of an instructional improvement agency? Can or should such an agency address a broad range of activities or should it specialize? What are some criteria which might be used to decide upon an appropriate program or agency emphasis?

The purpose of this chapter is to raise some of the issues and concerns that an instructional improvement agency or program should consider in selecting an emphasis or orientation for its services. The chapter will first present some assumptions and definitions, followed by a discussion of the relationship between FD, OD, and ID, including the concept of "readiness for innovation." Next

the authors will present three factors which should be considered in selecting an orientation or emphasis. The chapter will conclude with a disucssion of seven alternative emphases and their implications.

ASSUMPTIONS AND DEFINITIONS

This chapter assumes that in order for the process of teaching or the process of learning to improve, some aspect of the existing instructional system must change. The faculty members' knowledge, skills, or attitudes must change; the instructional content or process must change; or the organizational environment in which instruction takes place must change. Any instructional system component or change perceived as new by an adopting individual or group is defined as an instructional innovation. Thus, the fundamental assumption of the chapter is that teaching and learning can be improved if an appropriate instructional innovation is adopted by individual faculty members and accepted by their organization.

It is recognized that the term "instructional innovation" is a relative one; an idea or technique perceived as new by one faculty member or department may not be perceived as new by another. Moreover, it is acknowledged that adoption of a particular instructional innovation by a faculty member and her/his organization is no guarantee that instructional efficiency or effectiveness will be increased. Nevertheless, improvement of teaching or learning at any level is assumed to involve the adoption of some instructional innovation by faculty members and their organization.

The Relationship Between FD, OD, and ID

Before dealing with the selection of emphasis for an instructional improvement agency, it will be useful to review the relationship between FD, OD, and ID within the context of improving instruction throught the adoption of instructional innovations. For purposes of this chapter, FD, OD, and ID are defined as follows:

> Faculty Development emphasizes activities which increase the faculty members' knowledge, skills, sensitivities, and instructional techniques, so that they are better able to fulfill their teaching responsibilities.
>
> Organizational Development emphasizes activities which seek to change the structure, policies, and organizational environment in which instruction takes place in order to make that environment more supportive of instructional change.
>
> Instructional Development emphasizes those activities that deal directly with the systematic design, development, implementation, and evaluation of instructional materials, lessons, courses, or curricula in order to improve student learning or teaching efficiency.

As discussed in a previous paper (Abedor and Sachs, 1978), the authors contend that FD, OD, and ID are integrally related to each other within the larger process of bringing about the adoption of an instructional innovation having the potential for improving teaching and learning. We suggest that there is a spiral relationship between FD, OD, and ID because FD and OD can create readiness for the instructional innovations produced through ID. That is, ID is a systematic method for finding, modifying, or developing instructional innovations. But finding, modifying, or developing an instructional innovation, however, is only a part of the larger process of bringing about instructional change. It is also necessary that the innovations be accepted by the adopting faculty and their organizations. Therefore, both individual faculty members and their organizations must be made "ready" to adopt an instructional innovation developed through ID. "Readiness" for innovation is created by FD and OD activities, and is a major factor in determining the degree to which ID activities will be undertaken and the degree to which they will be successful.

Readiness for instructional innovation (i.e., readiness to engage in ID) involves both individual faculty members and organizational components (Abedor and Sachs, 1978). It is the combination of individual and organizational readiness that facilitates the ID process and the adoption of innovations. Characteristics such as existing attitudes, beliefs, values, skills, and knowledge all tend to influence a faculty member's readiness to engage in instructional innovation. Unless an individual faculty member possesses some minimal level of readiness, it is unlikely that s/he would voluntarily become involved in instructional innovation--ID.

But no matter how "ready" an individual faculty member might be for ID, if any instructional innovation is to survive in the long term, then the organization within which the faculty member functions must, at the very least, tolerate or accept the innovation. In this regard, organizations possess several characteristics which affect their readiness to change or to accept the innovations proposed by their members. These characteristics include the structures, rewards, norms, resources, and policies of the organizations. Again, unless there is some minimal level of organizational readiness, it is unlikely that any individual member's instructional innovation will survive very long.

It should be emphasized that it is the combined level of individual faculty readiness and organizational readiness which determines the degree to which ID activities will be engaged in and whether any resulting instructional innovation will achieve long-term survival. But what if either individual or organizational readiness is too low for ID--what then? In such a case, the instructional improvement agency could pursue one of two courses of action. One alternative would be to reduce the perceived innovativeness of any instructional change to a level which is compatible with the existing level of readiness. In other words, the agency would seek to engage the faculty

member and her/his organization in a simpler, more elementary level of ID resulting in less innovative instructional changes. The underlying principle for this alternative is that those instructional innovations which are most likely to be adopted and used on a long-term basis are those in which the actual change involved (the innovativeness) does not exceed the existing level of individual and/or organizational readiness.

For example, if there was not a sufficient level of readiness to support the development and adoption of self-paced, modularized, instructional units (a rather radical change from conventional lectures), a faculty member and her/his department might be willing to adopt the innovation of a slide-tape program to substitute for a regular lecture--a less radical change. If this innovation proved successful, the overall level of readiness would probably be increased and the use of slide-tapes could be extended to additional lectures. In this way, the individual and the organization could eventually achieve a level of readiness which would support the originally-proposed innovation: self-paced, modularized, instructional units.

As an alternative to lowering the level of innovation to suit the existing state of individual and organizational readiness, FD and OD activities can be introduced which are designed to increase the level of readiness. For example, faculty members may be encouraged to attend workshops or seminars provided by the instructional improvement agency, make site visits to centers of instructional innovation, or attend professional meetings which emphasize teaching in their respective disciplines. Organizational development might be stimulated by agency staff interviewing department chairpersons or deans to identify instructional, organizational, or resource allocation concerns which might be addressed. In this sense, FD and OD may be regarded as processes through which individual and organizational readiness for instructional innovation can be increased. It is interesting to note that in describing FD programs nationwide, Gaff (1975) indicated that changes in factors such as faculty attitudes, values, skills, and sensitivities were important FD outcomes--the same outcomes that can influence individual readiness. Moreover, Bergquist and Phillips (1977) suggest that OD activities should emphasize structural changes, resource allocation, and faculty reward systems--the same factors that affect organizational readiness for instructional innovation. It can be said, therefore, that while FD and OD activities can have other outcomes, they can certainly be oriented towards increasing the level of individual and organizational readiness for instructional innovation.

In answering the question, then, as to what is the relationship between FD, OD, and ID, it is suggested that the relationship is spiral. FD and OD can create or increase the readiness for the innovations produced through ID. Success with early innovations in turn creates additional individual and organizational readiness for more radical innovations. Thus, FD, OD, and ID can each contribute to increasing the level of readiness, which gradually permits more radical innovations to be introduced into a given instructional system.

THREE FACTORS TO CONSIDER IN CHOOSING A PROGRAMMATIC EMPHASIS FOR AN INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT AGENCY

It has been suggested that FD, OD, and ID all play an important part in the overall process of improving instruction through the development and adoption of instructional innovations. It has also been observed that some instructional improvement agencies across the country tend to emphasize one or perhaps two programmatic areas (e.g., FD and ID), while others try to maintain a balance between FD, OD, and ID activities. From the standpoint of efficiency, effectiveness, and survivability, what agency stategy is best--to emphasize one kind of activity (e.g., FD), to focus upon two kinds of activities (e.g., FD and ID), or to seek a balance across all three? What factors or criteria might be used in making this decision?

In answer to these questions, we suggest that there are at least three factors an instructional improvement agency should consider in determining whether to emphasize FD, OD, or ID. The three factors are:

1. The overall level or readiness for innovation.
2. The size and capabilities of the instructional improvement staff.
3. The availability of outside consultants.

Factor 1: The Overall Level of Readiness for Innovation

While there is no precise formula for calculating the levels of individual and organizational readiness, it is possible to identify the critical features which could either facilitate or block the adoption of an innovation. Through in-depth interviews with faculty members and administrators, careful analysis of past ID projects, collection of survey data, and group discussions, enough information can be gathered to describe the level of readiness.

There are many sources which can be used to develop the questions that might be asked in assessing the overall level of readiness (for example, see Beckhard, 1969; Bergquist and Phillips, 1977; Dwyer, 1976; Lindquist, 1978; Spitzer, 1976 and 1977; and Watson, 1974). When working with groups, the nominal-group technique (Delbecq, Van de Ven, and Gustafson, 1975) is an excellent method of identifying and prioritizing issues without having the group become polarized or wasting time on spurious issues. Other useful strategies for collecting information from individuals in group settings can be found in Merry and Allerhand (1977).

Of the many characteristics which can contribute to individual faculty and organizational

readiness, several were selected by Abedor and Sachs (1978) as appearing most important. These individual faculty characteristics include:

1. ATTITUDES which are positive toward self, teaching, and change.
2. VALUES which place importance on teaching and student learning.
3. BELIEFS that instructional improvement is possible and worthwhile.
4. SKILLS in organizing and delivering information.
5. KNOWLEDGE of subject matter, innovations, and teaching methods and strategies.

The characteristics that are most important for organizational readiness are:

1. STRUCTURE which allows open and free communication and group problem-solving.
2. REWARDS for teaching or related activities.
3. NORMS that support innovation.
4. RESOURCES to support innovation.
5. POLICIES that permit trial of innovations.

Just as there is no precise formula for calculating the overall level of readiness, it is not possible to define a single level of readiness which is "enough." This is because different levels of innovation require different levels of readiness. For example, adding overhead transparencies to a lecture is a less radical innovation and would require less readiness than changing from a lecture format to self-instructional modules.

Rogers and Shoemaker (1971) describe five characteristics of innovations which can be used to identify the relative innovativeness of a proposed change. Later work by Caffarella, et al. (1979) confirms the usefulness of this framework. The five characteristics are:

1. The relative advantage of the innovation compared to the existing practice.
2. The compatibility of the innovation with the existing practice.
3. The complexity of the innovation.
4. The ability to try out the innovation prior to full-scale adoption.
5. The ability to observe results of the innovation showing it to be an improvement over the existing practice.

In sum, the assessment of the overall level of readiness would be a major factor in determining whether to emphasize FD, OD, or ID activities. Overall readiness would be determined by collecting information about the five characteristics of the organization in which the innovation would be used. The relative innovativeness of any proposed change should also be factored into the decision process. An innovation representing a small change from the status quo might easily be compatible with the existing level of individual and organizational readiness; hence there may be little need for FD or OD. On the other hand, a major instructional change may exceed the existing level of readiness and require considerable FD and/or OD before adoption is possible.

Factor 2: Size and Capabilities of the Instructional Improvement Staff

The size and capabilities of the instructional improvement staff has much to do with whether an instructional improvement agency should emphasize FD, OD or ID in its activities. An ID-oriented program will require the largest staff since each member will be limited in the number of faculty members which can be assisted at one time. Diamond, et al. (1975), in one of the few texts which deal with administering an ID service, suggests that a single developer can handle only three or four major projects (where the developer and faculty member collaborate in the effort) at a time. This suggestion seems to be borne out in current practice in many ID centers around the country.

Close collaboration between the developer and the faculty member is a good strategy when the design will be complex or when the faculty member has little ID skill. Yet, the amount of time required of the developer can be adjusted depending upon who is expected to do the actual development work. In a pure ID setting, the developer will assume the major responsibility and can work on fewer projects; but as the setting changes toward FD, with the developer only providing suggesitons or tutoring the faculty member on how to perform various ID skills, a greater number of faculty members can be served. Davies (1975) provides a good description of various developer-client orientations.

An FD-oriented program can function effectively with a smaller staff since a great many FD activities can be provided through workshop formats in which one staff member deals with 10, 20, or more individuals at a time. Since the goal of such FD programs is to equip faculty members to do their own ID, there is less of a limitation on the number of faculty members served. This does not imply that an FD-oriented program is highly theoretic rather than "hands-on." Many very successful FD workshops are designed to allow participants to improve their own course materials or to practice and receive feedback on their presentation skills while teaching one of their own lessons.

An OD-oriented program can also function with a very small staff (perhaps only one person) whose function is to coordinate the OD efforts, support the changes being carried out by members of the organization, and facilitate the institutionalization of those changes. OD is not something a developer does for an organization; it is something the members of the organization must do for themselves with the guidance of the developer.

OD is generally more successful when outside consultants or special interdisciplinary task forces are used (Fullan, Miles, and Taylor, 1980; Bennis, 1969). Or, as Margulies (1972) pointed out when he described an OD project at a western university:

> One major problem in organizations in general is the resistance to accepting help. In universities the issue probably is of major importance. The academic culture, for example, requires that the "help" process be conducted by individuals with all the necessary paraphernalia and credentials.

Since an instructional improvement agency rarely performs OD without some ID or FD, it is usually desirable to limit the amount of OD it undertakes on its own. The delicate and somewhat threatening nature of OD could put the instructional improvement agency in a dangerous position if it attempts to do too much without the legitimization provided by outside consultants or task forces. In the process of resolving conflicts between the faculty and the administration, for example, its own reputation could become so tarnished that it loses the appearance of neutrality necessary for successful ID and FD.

Factor 3: Availability of Outside Consultants

Outside consultants can be used to augment the instructional improvement staff and are the "wild-cards" in the FD, OD, ID selection process. As pointed out in the preceding section, outside consultants are very important to successful OD activities, particularly if organizational readiness for innovation is low. However, outside consultants can be used to strengthen FD and ID activ ities as well. If outside consultants are available to conduct FD workshops (and if funds are available to pay for these services), the instructional improvement staff might then be free to take on ID projects. An outside consultant might also be hired to do ID, either in collaboration with a faculty member or with an agency staff member, thus providing a temporary ID thrust which would not otherwise be available.

Deciding whether and how to best use outside consultants has been a topic of several recent texts such as Pilon and Bergquist (1979), Bell and Nadler (1979) and Brown, Wyne, Blackburn and Powell (1979). Some authors favor the use of outside consultants over the hiring of additional in-house staff. They argue that it is cheaper, in the long run, than hiring permanent staff; the instructional improvement agency has more flexibility and access to a wider pool of expertise; and the consultants, rather than the in-house staff, can absorb project animosity should any occur. The critical assumption in the use of consultants, however, is that the employing agency has accurately diagnosed its own needs and knows exactly what kind of consultant should be hired. This assumption, unfortunately is not always met. Another possible flaw in the use of consultants is the fact that consultats leave but projects continue. There needs to be some kind of in-house follow-up support after an FD, OD or ID consultant has done his/her "thing" for the instructional improvement program. In sum, the use of outside consultants is a feasible mechanism for augmenting FD, OD, or ID activities or for giving an instructional improvement program a temporary boost in a weak or nonexistent area. The decision to use a consultant should be based upon an accurate assessment of the need for a particular FD, OD, or ID activity, which in turn should be based upon the assessment of the overall readiness for innovation of the faculty and upon the size and capabilities of the staff. In any case, some in-house follow-up support is desirable following any intervention by an outside consultant.

SEVEN ALTERNATIVE EMPHASES FOR INSTRUCTIONAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMS

At the beginning of this chapter it was mentioned that various instructional improvement programs across the country have differed in their emphasis among FD, OD, and ID activities. The next section suggested several criteria which might be used in selecting an appropriate emphasis. This final section will describe seven alternative program emphases and suggest several advantages and disadvantages for each. Figure 31-1 summarizes the various options with respect to program emphasis. The names given to each option are intended to be descriptive of the emphasis the option represents.

Training Programs

This popular approach is primarily an FD orientation that provides such services as skill building workshops, travel support for faculty, and values clarification exercises. There is little or no active involvement in ID or OD. Among the strengths of this type of program are its ability to reach a large number of faculty members efficiently and the placing of responsibility for improving instruction upon the individual faculty member. However, there are a number of important drawbacks to its use. For example, there is no guarantee that the faculty member will actually apply the training to the improvement of instruction, or that the training will provide enough skills to allow them to do so. Furthermore, as the faculty members attempt more instructional innovation on their own, there may not be sufficient organizational resources to support all the proposed changes or to differentiate among those changes in order to support those which promise the greatest payoff. And, when a faculty member leaves the organization, the results of the training will leave also.

Traditional OD Emphasis

This is an orientation which provides little or no FD or ID involvement. While rarely practiced by instructional improvement services, it can be found in institutions where the only instructional

Figure 31-1. Level of FD, OD, or ID activity associated with different program orientations.

Program Orientation	Level of Activity* FD	OD	ID
a. Training	high	low	low
b. Traditional OD	low	high	low
c. Traditional ID	low	low	high
d. Organizational Renewal	high	high	low
e. Change Agent/Service Agency	high	low	high
f. Management Consultant	low	high	high
g. Comprehensive Development	high	high	high

*Where a low level of activity is indicated, it is assumed that either the faculty or organization is already at a high enough level of readiness or that the individual or organization will perform the function without assistance from the instructional improvement agency.

support is provided by the office of institutional research or where administrators bring in OD consultants to "improve the instructional climate." This type of program can create a climate in which the faculty is more free to innovate and where more of the organization's resources are available to support such innovation. However, there is no direct application to the improvement of instruction and all improvements depend upon the existing skills of the faculty. Another drawback to this approach is that, while the OD is going on, the faculty may avoid making any significant course changes, waiting instead until the turmoil and organizational change settles down.

Traditional ID Emphasis

The ID orientation is typified by those programs that operate a service-on-demand basis. These programs may advertise their services but do not normally engage in FD or OD to increase readiness. However, through repeated successes with ID projects, readiness can be increased. The availability of professional ID assistance increases the likelihood that there will be successes and that instructional improvement projects will be of a higher quality than if such assistance were not available. Unfortunately, the number of projects that can be undertaken will be limited by the size of the staff, and the nature of the innovations which can be proposed will be limited by the existing levels of individual faculty and organizational readiness. One great danger faced by ID-only programs is that they will lose administrative support because too few faculty members are ready to seek their help or because those few faculty members who do ask for ID assistance are not perceived as being important enough by the administration to justify the expense of the ID program.

Each of the preceding program orientations is impractical in most settings because each either fails to sufficiently promote readiness or fails to provide enough substance to significantly improve instruction. Instructional improvement agencies are thus more likely to employ one of the orientations described in the following, which combine the strengths and overcome some of the weaknesses of providing FD, OD, or ID alone.

Organizational Renewal Programs

This type of program combines FD and OD in order to create a climate which allows faculty members an excellent opportunity to innovate on their own. Little or no ID assistance is provided. This type of program can also allow the organization to establish new mechanisms for prioritizing and supporting its instructional improvement efforts. Nonetheless, with this approach instructional improvement is still limited by the skills of individual faculty members and their willingness to actually apply the training they receive.

Change Agent/Service Agency Programs

The majority of instructional improvement agencies probably use this orientation, combining an emphasis on FD with an emphasis on ID. It allows them to take active steps to increase individual faculty readiness for innovation through FD, and to provide ID services for larger and more complex projects which are beyond the skills of the individual faculty members. Such programs seldom, if ever, undertake OD. This mix of FD and ID is a strong one because it can reach a large number of faculty members and give them tools to improve instruction on their own, while providing professional ID assistance that can improve the quality and the potential for success of ID projects. Any such successes help further increase the overall level of readiness. However, it is possible for the instructional improvement agency to generate more demand for ID assistance than it can provide or more interest in innovation than the organization is ready for. Furthermore, just as when FD and ID are practiced alone, there is no guarantee that faculty members will apply their training to real instructional problems or that those who need help will seek it without direct intervention by the organization's administration.

Management Consultant Program

New departments or major institutional restructuring, or some type of emergency needs, may lead to a program with an ID-OD orientation. While the role of faculty in designing or improving instruction is not denied, the press of time and need to address specific problems in the most effective and efficient method rules out FD. Of course, this can lead to serious problems if the faculty is not ready for the innovations developed by the ID staff. This approach allows for major changes that the organization might not otherwise accept, but develops little commitment on the part of the faculty to continue to upgrade the courses after the ID staff has completed its work. This orientation may be good for getting a new academic or training program started quickly, but after the OD effort is well under way the program usually begins to revert to an ID-only program unless another orientation is chosen.

Comprehensive Development Program

When an instructional improvement agency offers FD, OD, and ID, it is in the strongest position to improve instruction and create conditions which encourage and assist faculty members to make really significant improvements in their courses. Yet, there is a temptation with such a broad program to try to do too much too quickly. It is just as important with the comprehensive program as it is with all the others to let the overall level of readiness be the limiting factor on instructional innovation. This comprehensive orientation simply offers more latitude for increasing that readiness.

CHOOSING AN EMPHASIS: FD, OD, OR ID

At this point, it would be highly desirable to present a flowchart or other decision aid that includes all the options and indicates which of the seven program orientations would be most appropriate. Unfortunately, the decision process is far too complex and imprecise for such an approach. There are too many intervening variables, such as organizational politics, personalities, budgets, and climate, that affect the choice of an orientation.

Nonetheless, we offer the following guidelines to assist in choosing an orientation. First, if faculty and organizational readiness are not above some minimal level, then the orientation of the program should include FD, OD, or both. Second, if the instructional improvement staff is small and consultants are not available, then it would be a good idea to avoid orientations that require ID. If consultants are available, then some ID can be undertaken in conjunction with FD. Third, if consultants are not available then OD orientations probably should be avoided. Fourth, if organizational readiness is a problem and outside consultants are not available, FD or successful small-scale ID projects should be used. This will raise the overall level of readiness to compensate for the low level of organizational readiness. While it may severely limit what can be done, it is better than spending all the agency's resources and credibility fighting the system and having little or no direct impact upon the improvement of instruction. The application of some of these guidelines can be seen in the following examples.

Small Staff—Tough Situation

The first example involves a small junior college tightly controlled by its president and its business manager. The focus of the institution was on vocational courses with most of the faculty drawn from practicing professionals in the community. Most had little or no teaching experience and all had heavy teaching loads. The reward structure at the college was weighted toward longevity and cooperation with the administration. The instructional improvement staff at this junior college consisted of one full-time audiovisual

director/instructional developer and one full-time audiovisual technician.

While FD and OD were called for, OD was ruled out due to lack of administrative support and to a lack of staff. FD was a problem because the administration had experienced many problems with workshops in the past and wanted instructional improvement handled on a one-to-one basis with individual faculty members.

The instructional improvement program finally initiated was the change agent/service agency orientation (FD and ID). Given the small staff, no large ID projects were attempted since they would have required too much of the developer's time. Instead, the developer identified particular needs which could be met quickly and easily. For many faculty members this involved finding one or more films to rent and building units of instruction around them. Success with these quick and dirty units built up faculty trust and interest in the instructional improvement service, and allowed the developer to tutor faculty members individually or in groups of two or three. This tutoring took the form of discussing faculty problems, proposing possible solutions, and giving the faculty members the tools and guidelines for making their own improved materials, or providing models of instructional techniques (good lectures, handouts, syllabi, etc.) which they could imitate.

One major aspect of this program was that the developer placed most of the responsibility for choosing the appropriate innovation and adapting it to a particular course in the hands of the faculty member. This allowed the developer to work with more faculty members and to provide each with enough guidance to insure successes. It allowed the faculty members to work within their existing levels of readiness. And it allowed the administration to accept these small changes without feeling unduly threatened. Within about a year faculty members were seeking more and more help; several of them were trying to get support for larger ID projects; and the administrators, pleased with the signs of instructional improvement they could point to, were beginning to ask what other things could be done. This is an illustration of the symbiotic relationship that allows readiness to be increased when other avenues are blocked.

Flexibility at a University

The second example involves a large university with a number of full-time developers and with the ability to make some limited use of consultants. Because of its size and open administration, the developers were reasonably free to do what they wished. When they needed special organizational cooperation, they were generally able to get it by working with the vice president for academic affairs. Teaching interest and abilities varied across the campus.

Initially, the instructional improvement agency took a comprehensive development orientation (FD-OD-ID) but found that the OD component was causing some problems even though they used an outside consultant to assist them. Because OD took a lot of time and created a certain amount of disruption within the organization, some resentment toward the agency built up among various faculty members and department chairpeople. While a certain amount of this resentment was natural resistance to change, the agency found that a disturbing amount was because people were being asked to spend time and energy on non-problems. After almost three years, the program was modified to a change agent/service agency orientation, but bad feelings remained for some time after the change. In this case, the agency did not account for the level of readiness that already existed and it got them into trouble.

Purchasing Instructional Improvement

The third example involves a new professional school which was in the midst of rapid growth. To provide coordination and quality control of instruction without taking up too much time that was needed for other matters, the administration and faculty agreed to try the management consultant model (OD-ID). An instructional improvement coordinator was hired to work either with consultants or temporary employees on the design of specific competency-based courses, and to develop the policies and procedures necessary to integrate these courses with the existing non-competency-based courses still being taught.

Initially this process worked well, as the existing courses outnumbered the new ones. It was a fast way of putting together courses and setting up the organizational structures necessary to monitor them. However, when it came time to convert some of the existing courses to a competency-based approach, faculty resistance developed and the entire project ground to a halt. This particular program orientation was appropriate for the initial start-up, the individual faculty members were ready for that, but when used on a sustained basis without increasing individual readiness, it was too much for them.

SOME CONCLUDING COMMENTS

Not all instructional improvement requires radical innovation. Nor do instructional improvement agencies need to play major roles in solving all instructional problems. Faculty in many cases are willing and able to make major improvement given a little help. As Geis and Smith (1979), found in their study of faculty perceptions of teaching and learning, faculty believe that given time and a small amount of resources they can make the necessary improvements themselves. While faculty-directed projects may be smaller or less effective than those conducted with instructional improvement agency input, they are legitimate efforts that ought to be encouraged, rather than put on hold until the agency has time to work with them. The implication is that faculty members

may be ready to proceed, and that they need a few ID skills more than they need an ID consultant to help them.

In the end it is the sensitivity, effort, and skill of the developer that will govern the selection of the instructional improvement agency's orientation toward FD, OD, and ID. After all, since there is no single correct formula for improving instruction, it is up to the developer to find a combination of activities or emphases that gets the most out of the time and effort spent upon the improvement effort at his/her institution. By raising some of the issues and concerns which should be addressed in choosing an emphasis, it is hoped that the productivity and effectiveness of our instructional improvement efforts will be enhanced.

REFERENCES

Abedor, A.J. & Sachs, S.G. The relationship between faculty development (FD), organizational development (OD) and instructional development (ID): Readiness for instructional innovation in higher education. In R.K. Bass, & C.R. Dills and D.B. Lumsden (Eds.), Instructional Development: The State of the Art. Collegiate Publishing, San Diego, Calif., 1978.

Alexander, L.T., & Yelon, S.L. (Eds.) Instructional Development Agencies In Higher Education. Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI: 1972. (ERIC document Reproduction Service No. ED 091 997).

Beckhard, R. Organizational Development: Strategies and Models. Addison-Wesley, Houston, TX, 1969.

Bell, C.R., & Nadler, L. (Eds.). The Client-Consultant Handbook. Gulf-Publishing, Houston, TX, 1979.

Bennis, W.G. Organizational Development: Its Nature, Origins, and Prospects. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA: 1969.

Bergquist, W.H., & Phillips, S.R. Components of an effective faculty development program. Journal of Higher Education, 1975, 46, 177-211.

Bergquist, W.H., & Phillips, S.R. A Handbook for Faculty Development (Vol. 2). Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges, Washington, D.C., 1977.

Brown, D., Wyne, M., Blackburn, J., & Powell, C. Consultation: Strategy for Improving Education. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, Mass., 1979.

Caffarella, E.P., Caffarella, R.S., Hart, J.E., Pooler, A.E., & Salesi, R.A. A method for predicting the diffusability of educational innovations. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Association for Educational Communications and Technology, New Orleans, March 1979.

Centra, J.A. Faculty development in the United States: Practices and programs. Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Improving University Teaching, Heidelberg, Germany, July 1976.

Davies, I. Some aspects of a theory of advice: The management of instructional developer-client relationship. Instructional Science, 1975, 3, 351-373.

Delbecq, A.L., Van de Ven, A.H., & Gustafson, D.H. Group Techniques For Program Planning. Scott Foresman, Glenview, IL: 1975.

Diamond, R.M., Eickman, P.E., Kelly, E.F., Holloway, R.E., Vickery, T.R., & Pascarella, E.T. Instructional Development For Individualized Learning In Higher Education. Educational Technology Publications, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1975.

Durzo, J.J. The organization and placement of instructional development programs in higher education: A review of the literature. In R.K. Bass, C. R. Dills and D.B. Lumsden (Eds.), Instructional Development: The State of the Art. Collegiate Publishing, San Diego, Calif. 1978.

Dwyer, M.S. Mastering change in education: Assessing readiness for change. Educational Technology, 1976, 16 (9), 52-56.

Fullan, M., Miles, M.D., & Taylor, G. Organizational development in schools: The state of the art. Review of Educational Research, 1980, 50 (1), 121-183.

Gaff, J.G. Towards Faculty Renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Geis, G.L., & Smith, R. Professors' perceptions of teaching and learning: Implications for faculty development. Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April 1979.

Lawrason, R.E. Politics of instructional development in higher education. In R.K. Bass, C.R. Dills, & D.B. Lumsden (Eds.), Instructional Development: The State of the Art. Collegiate Publishing, San Diego, Calif., 1978.

Lindquist, J. (Ed.). Designing Teaching Improvement Programs. Pacific Soundings Press: Berkeley, CA, 1978.

Margulies, N. Organizational development in a university setting: Some problems of initiating change. Educational Technology, 1972, 12 (10), 48-51.

Merry, U., & Allerhand, M.E. Developing Teams and Organizations: A Practical Handbook For Managers and Consultants. Addison-Wesley: Reading, MA, 1977.

Pilon, D.H., & Bergquist, W.H. Consultation In Higher Education. Council for the Advancement of Small Colleges: Washington, D.C., 1979.

Rogers, E.M., & Shoemaker, F.F. Communication Of Innovations: A Cross-Cultural Approach (2nd ed.). Free Press: New York, N.Y., 1971.

Sargent, A.G. Developing basic skills and knowledge. Training and Development Journal, May 1979, 72-76.

Spitzer, D.R. A new look at organizational theory.

Educational Technology, 1976, 16 (11), 25-30.

Spitzer, D.R. Incentives in instructional development. Educational Technology, 1977, 17 (8), 17-21.

Watson, P.G. Implementing ID in higher education institutions. Educational Technology, 1974, 14 (7), 11-16.